



**Mennonite
World Conference**

A Community of Anabaptist
related Churches

**Congreso
Mundial Menonita**

Una Comunidad de
Iglesias Anabautistas

**Conférence
Mennonite Mondiale**

Une Communauté
d'Eglises Anabaptistes

Leadership and Communion

César has formulated our task for today in this way: “We are interested in what you have to say to leaders of national churches in light of your experience in Mennonite World Conference and in the Global Christian Forum. The topic of your presentation could be ‘Leadership that Facilitates Unity’ or ‘Leadership that Builds Communion’. What characteristics are important for leaders of national churches in order to build communion? What are leadership weaknesses that effect negatively meetings and even relationships among church leaders?’ In short, the question is what kind of leaders do we need in order to have healthy meetings and especially, beyond meetings, healthy global communion?”

As I did yesterday, I would like to begin with the Bible. There is one passage that stands out in my mind most prominently in relation to today’s theme. My journey of more than 30 years with national church leaders in Mennonite World Conference as well as with global church leaders in both MWC and the Global Christian Forum has led me to believe that this passage is foundational for leadership who receive the gift of communion, who nurture the gift of communion, who enable life together in communion.

Philippians 2:1-5

If then there is any encouragement in Christ, any consolation from love, any sharing in the Spirit, any compassion and sympathy, make my joy complete: be of the same mind, having the same love, being in full accord and of one mind.

Do nothing from selfish ambition or conceit, but in humility regard others as better than yourselves. Let each of you look not to your own interests, but to the interests of others. Let the same mind be in you that was in Christ Jesus.

Paul addressed this word to a local community, to a local ‘communion’. But I receive it as a word to guide *all believers* in relation to one another, *all leaders* in relation to one another, *all churches* in relation to one another: local churches, national churches, global churches.

Of course, today we have primarily in mind communion in the global church, communion in Mennonite World Conference, communion between MWC member churches, communion between General Council members as leaders of the global communion.

General Council perspectives: survey results

When César and I were discussing today’s presentation, we agreed that we need to hear not only from me but also from you. We know that you are rich in experience and wisdom. That is why earlier this year General Council members received a questionnaire soliciting perspectives on ‘Leadership that Builds Communion’. It included questions about values, convictions, attitudes, and practices related to ‘communion’ or ‘oneness’ or ‘unity’ in the church.

The picture of General Council members' perspectives on 'communion' resulting from this survey is based on a limited sampling: only about one-third of Council members responded to the questionnaire. And the survey was done with members of the previous General Council, not the current one. So, we would need to exercise caution before concluding that the results provide a representative snapshot of General Council member perspectives. Still, according to Conrad Kanagy, the sociologist who helped us with the questionnaire, it is a large enough sampling to suggest what most General Council members probably think.

Further note: what I will report now is a very short version of the results of the questionnaire. Full results will be posted online, together with Conrad's interpretation of them and the text of this presentation.

Valuing communion

One part of the questionnaire deals with the value respondents attribute to communion, or oneness, or unity in the church. MWC's vision statement says that it is "called to be a communion of Anabaptist-related churches." But how important is 'communion' for MWC member churches? How important is it for you, General Council members? The responses to several survey questions provide clues about how highly you and your churches value communion.

Here is one of the questions:

As you consider your local, national, and global church (MWC) are there differences between these three spheres of church in how you think about the importance or value of (...) communion? (Q21)

In principle, respondents consider communion to be an important value in each of the three spheres of church life. In practice, however, they seem to value it more highly for local and national level churches than for the global church, for MWC. Some comments suggest that in the MWC, unity can be 'looser' or 'wider'. In any case, respondents say, the search for communion in the global church should not require local and national churches to abandon their own convictions, even if this makes communion more 'tenuous' globally than locally or nationally.

The answers to another question point in the same direction:

(...) what characteristics (...) of a leader does your local, national, or global church (MWC) consider to be most important for those who are called to lead? (...) (Q6)

Of all respondents, only one said his church considered a leader's ability to nurture 'oneness' as one of the most important characteristics for a leader, and this was in relation to leading a local church. No respondent mentioned the capacity to build 'communion' or 'unity' as a characteristic their churches considered most important for its leaders.

Responses to a third question provide some reassurance about the importance of a leader's capacity to build communion, even though at the same time the responses relativize the importance of this capacity, especially at the global level. The question:

How important is it to your local, national, or global church (MWC) that a leader (...) shows that he/she (...) behaves in ways that cultivate communion (...) as part of their calling? (Q8)

78% (19) said that it is very or extremely important in the local church. 82% (19) said that it is very or extremely important in the national church. Only 57% (9) perceive it as very or extremely important to MWC.

It seems to me that the answers to these questions raise a question for MWC. MWC's vision statement says that it is 'called to be a communion'. But if communion is more highly valued for local churches and national churches than for MWC, how is MWC to fulfill its calling to be a communion?

Building communion

Whatever value is accorded to communion, nurturing and growing communion requires leaders able to do so. *What are characteristics of leaders capable of building communion?* There were a number of questions seeking your wisdom about this. And you had a lot to say in response! Your list of characteristics of communion-building leaders is long!

'Qualities that rose to the top were sensitivity to the Holy Spirit and the Spirit's guidance. Communicating effectively, exhibiting humility toward one another, and listening were often emphasized (...) Love for God and one another, as well as integrity received numerous mentions. Other characteristics you identified were patience, empathy, forgiveness, valuing others in their diversity, (...) organizing projects together; and, appreciating the gifts of others.'¹

Not infrequently in our tradition, we separate unity and discipleship, considering discipleship more important than unity. Do responses about the characteristics of leaders who build communion change when *the call to practice discipleship* is explicitly added to *the call to promote unity*?

One question tried to find out:

*What characteristics of leaders (...) have you found to be most important for facilitating (...) unity in the church **while seeking obedience to Christ?***"

The list of characteristics here is similar to the previous list but it seems to become a little more concrete. It includes these things:

'(...) self-examination, leadership training to build peace, (...) proactive dialogue, preference for the marginalized, (...) awareness of how people in the group are doing and feeling, (...), valuing each participant's presence, moving slowly, (...), understanding that others in the group may differ from me but are also children of God.'²

Building communion is most difficult when seeking to hear what the Spirit is saying about a divisive issue. What are essential leadership qualities for building communion *in the context of conflict*? One question sought your insights on this matter.

*When discerning what the Spirit is saying about **a potentially divisive issue**, what are the most important leadership qualities for bringing about communion (...)?*

Here, too, your list is long, with additional practical elements added to the previous lists. It includes:

'(...); a commitment to the spiritual practices of solitude, silence, listening; conciliatory dialogue; (...); emphasizing John 17; scripture, prayer, and self-examination; prayer for indifference to everything except the will of God; leading a situation rather than trying to manage it, (...); listening with openness; (...); making sure each voice is heard(...).³

Harming communion

The other side of building communion is harming communion. Your insight in regard to leadership characteristics that build communion is matched only by your awareness of leadership characteristics that harm communion, as your responses to several questions suggest.

Here is one of those questions:

What characteristics of leaders (...) tend to limit communion (...) and that instead lead toward conflict and disunity? (Q12)

You identified more than 40 characteristics of leaders that harm or destroy communion, including these:

'(...) failure to study a problem; lack of communication; lack of relationship; tone of voice; (...); stubbornness; (...) inflexibility; wrong assumptions; (...). impatience, selfishness, ambition, (...) uninformed opinions, (...) speaking rather than listening; (...), abuse of power; incompetence; tribalism; (...); uncontrolled emotions; (...) lobbying (...) in which one seeks to build majorities (...). Dictatorial leadership, (...) proudly holding to one answer, unwillingness to forgive, hidden agendas (...).'⁴

When our sociologist, Conrad Kanagy, saw this list, he had this to say:

'The specificity of the negative attributes of leadership suggest that these leaders are grounded in and familiar with conflict, tension, and division in their church contexts. These answers are not offered in the abstract but obviously within and out of pain.'⁵

Breaking communion

Sadly, as we all know, not only can communion be harmed, sometimes it is broken. Thus the survey question:

Is there ever an appropriate reason for breaking communion in the church (...)? What might be valid reasons (...) for breaking communion?

Though very supportive of unity in principle, a very large majority of respondents believe that there are times when breaking communion is more important than maintaining unity. Only 15% of respondents (5 or 6 persons) said 'no', there is never a valid reason to break communion. 85% said 'yes', sometimes there are valid reasons to do so; for some breaking communion is understood as following Jesus' example, who they say broke communion with the leaders of his day.

Not only did a large majority of respondents say that there can be valid reasons for breaking communion, they suggested more than 30 situations where doing so can be justified:

'(...) when there are deep theological differences that reorient the church; when the teachings of Jesus are abandoned; where there are unbiblical practices and lifestyles; (...); where there is no possibility of repentance of sinful attitudes (...); when there is sexual violence; (...); when the divinity of Christ is questioned; when there is exploitation of the weak and voiceless; (...).' ¹⁶

(...), when diverse values (...) take parties in different directions; where there is failure to pursue the mission of God; when leaders are not wanting to follow the Holy Spirit; when one's integrity is assaulted (...) when the Bible is not used as a reference point; where there are different views of same-sex relationships (...).' According to one respondent, '(...) human strength can only tolerate conflict and discord for so long before finding more peaceful places to worship.' ⁷

In short, for General Council respondents to the questionnaire, even if one believes that communion is important, there are many valid reasons to break unity.

This conclusion leads naturally to another question:

How might one reconcile a decision to break (...) communion (...) in light of Jesus prayer for oneness and unity in John 17? (Q20)

No consensus emerges in response to this question. A few respondents think it is not possible to reconcile a decision to break communion with Jesus' prayer for unity. Others suggest that one can reconcile such a decision by observing that even if someone breaks communion and leaves or is excluded from the group, unity continues 'inside' the group, among those who remain. Some respondents justify a decision to break communion by pointing to the possibility of restoration of communion, after some time of division, through forgiveness and reconciliation. Others suggest simply this is not a matter for us to try to figure out: oneness is a matter of the heart. Only God sees the heart; all we can do is pray and leave it to the Lord.

Reflecting on the full results of the questionnaire, Conrad Kanagy offers this conclusion: There 'appears to be a bifurcation that runs right through the heart of MWC.' Theologically, respondents 'believe that unity cannot be broken nor should it be broken. And yet, for some situations and in some cases, they believe breaking communion is necessary. (...) This perhaps is the place of greatest discomfort, cognitive dissonance, and uncertainty for delegates.' ¹⁸

For consideration: beginning assumptions and potential practices

Given the limited number of respondents to the questionnaire, the results of the survey are provisional. We would need a larger body of respondents before concluding that the responses give us a 'representative' profile of General Council member values, attitudes, and convictions. But if we were together today, we could already enter into conversation about the picture that the survey projects. At what points do you agree with it? Where do you disagree with it? At what points does it describe your values, attitudes, and convictions about communion? Where does it not represent you well?

But since we are not together today in way that permits conversation, I will instead do what César has asked me to do and so far today I have done very little: speak more personally from my own experience with churches and church leaders in both MWC and the Global Christian Forum.

In my journey with the global church, I have indeed come to hold some values, claim some convictions, and promote some practices in an attempt to contribute to the fulfillment of our common calling to nurture the God-given gift of communion. But since I have always been able to see only 'through a glass darkly', as the Apostle Paul puts it, all I will do is offer some personal thoughts for your consideration, not as 'divine revelation' nor as 'immutable truth' but as 'working hypotheses'. And since I don't have a lot to add to the respondents' list of 'characteristics' of leaders who build communion and characteristics of leaders who harm communion, I will focus instead on few 'assumptions' and 'practices' related to leaders' building communion.

Building communion: beginning assumptions

Building communion begins, I think, with the assumptions that we carry into relations with other Christians, with other churches, with other church leaders. When I meet a Christian or a church or a church leader for the first time, with what assumptions do I begin the relationship? Do I assume that we hold together God's gift of communion? Or do I assume that we have not yet received it together, that we are not yet 'one', that we are not yet in 'communion' with one another?

I have made a little list of my own 'beginning assumptions' when meeting other Christians, other churches, other church leaders. It is a personal list; I do not know that any of you will agree with it! Instead, I invite each of you to formulate your own little list of 'beginning assumptions' about building communion with one another in the church.

Meanwhile, here's my list:

- 1 'Communion' is a gift of God to and a calling for every disciple and every church everywhere. It is as important globally as it is locally and nationally – and has been so from the earliest days of the church.
- 2 'Communion' in the body of Christ is one of the values found at the very top of the New Testament hierarchy of values.
- 3 Unity is no less important than discipleship. In fact, oneness in the body of Christ is an *indispensable* part of following Jesus in the world, and has been so from the earliest days of the church.
- 4 Unity is no less important than mission. Indeed, unity is foundational for mission, and has been so from the earliest days of the church.
- 5 I consider myself to be in communion with every person everywhere who has been baptized into the body of Jesus Christ and who confesses Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord—unless and until that other person breaks communion. My church should consider itself to be in communion with every other church everywhere unless and until the other church breaks communion.
- 6 I seek to learn from other Christians and other churches before I expect them to learn from me, from my church.
- 7 Divisive issues are to be appropriately embraced rather than rigorously avoided; they may become places of divine revelation and greater communion – as they have done from the earliest days of the church.
- 8 I am *never* called by God to break communion with another Christian. A church is never called by God to break communion with another church. But if communion is broken and

cannot be restored in a foreseeable future, we are called to accept the brokenness non-defensively, peacefully, lovingly – and to seek restoration of communion repeatedly, ceaselessly.

- 9 There is no more important characteristic of leaders able to build communion than humility – not just any kind of humility, but the kind described by Paul and practiced by Jesus (Philippians 2:1-8).

Humility requires self-examination. Sometimes, this self-examination can be enhanced by psychological insights:

- Each of us has an active ‘ego’, a hidden ‘shadow’, and a deeper ‘self’ (...).
 - The leaders most capable of building communion, it seems to me, are leaders in whom the deep ‘self’ is inhabited by Jesus Christ, sanctifying our ‘egos’, and illuminating our ‘shadows.’
- Sometimes I wonder:
 - Is it in fact my ‘ego’ or my ‘shadow’ that is guiding me even when I believe that I am listening to the Holy Spirit?
 - Is it really Christ who is living in my deepest ‘self’? Can I honestly say with the apostle Paul: ‘I have been crucified with Christ and I no longer live, but Christ lives in me (Galatians 2:20).
- I believe that these questions are useful for churches as well as for leaders of churches: churches, like church leaders, seem to me to have ‘egos’ and ‘shadow’ sides. Churches, like church leaders, have a deeper ‘self’ which Jesus Christ can inhabit. When this happens the church becomes more truly the body of Christ where the gift of communion is fully received, lovingly nurtured, and creatively built-up. For this to happen is a life-long journey for the leader and for the church; at least I know that it is for me.

Building communion: potential practices

At several points in the responses to the questionnaire, it was clear that putting the characteristics that build communion into practice is often the point where problems arise for us. Often we know what to do but we have difficulty doing it. As Anabaptist-Mennonite leaders, we may need to give more attention to figuring out how to practice what we preach!

We already have a statement of ‘Shared Convictions’, approved by the General Council in 2006. Is it time to put together a collection of General Council-approved ‘Shared Practices’, practices that build communion? Some of these can already be found in the *Reference Notebook* and in some of the *General Council Meeting Workbooks*. And scattered through the responses to the questionnaire, there are a few others that could be considered.

In addition to all of those permit me to suggest three ‘practices’ that might help build a little more communion in MWC and, more specifically, in the General Council.

1. *Recognizing Christ in One Another*

A first step in building communion is building trust. How does one bring into trusting conversation leaders from the widest possible range of Anabaptist-Mennonite churches? What can help us ‘recognize one another in Christ and Christ in one another’ rather than harboring lingering doubts about one another?

At the end of the 20th century, global Christianity was divided into more than 40 000 different denominations and at least two large streams, the older churches – Catholic, Orthodox, Anglican, Protestant – and the younger churches – Evangelical, Pentecostal, Charismatic, Independent. Usually, these churches and their leaders did not meet with each, did not trust each other, and often were hostile towards one another.

Some Christian leaders thought it was time to try to overcome or at least to reduce this divide: their initiative became known as the Global Christian Forum. But where to start? The core practice discovered early on and still used today is something very simple: the leaders are divided into small highly-mixed groups where each one—whether Catholic cardinal or Pentecostal preacher – tells the story of her or his ‘journey with Jesus Christ’ in the context of his or her church’s ‘journey with Jesus Christ’. This is done near the beginning of nearly every meeting so that the participants can begin to see ‘Christ in one another and one another in Christ’ *before* they engage each other on various issues, including church-dividing issues.

Two primary convictions underlie this practice:

- First, every Christian life is a journey with Jesus Christ. Every Christian leader has the story of a journey to tell. Each story can open our eyes to the presence of Christ and to the breath of the Spirit in the lives of other Christians, other leaders, and in the churches from which they come.
- Second, as we offer to each other and receive from each other our faith stories, the Spirit of God is at work. This is the Spirit of unity, the unity for which Christ prayed.

Perhaps this simple practice could be of some use in helping to increase communion in the General Council and in other settings where our churches meet, globally, nationally, or locally – especially when we meet for the first time. If you would like to know more about this practice, simple guides for “Sharing of Faith Stories in Groups” are available on the Global Christian Forum website. (You might also ask Anne-Cathy Graber about this practice; Anne-Cathy is a Faith and Life Commission member and MWC’s representative in the Global Christian Forum international committee.)

2. Learning Receptively from Each Other

If a first step in building communion is building trust in each other, a next step is learning from one another.

In the middle of the 20th century, a movement began in which churches divided from each other met to talk about what divided them. They would tell each other who they were, then identify points of convergence and points of divergences, attempting to reach as much agreement as possible. By the end of the 20th century, there was a sense that this approach had been useful in creating better understanding but hardly ever resulted in building ‘full communion’ between them.

In an attempt to overcome this limitation, an additional kind of conversation emerged. Terms used for referring to it are ‘receptive ecumenism’ and ‘receptive learning’. It is a flexible method that came first from conversations between churches at the international level but is now used in both national and local settings, both for groups of leaders and for groups of regular church members.

There are numerous descriptions and 'how to' guides for the practice of 'receptive learning'. They reveal the convictions that underlie the practice:

- First, learning receptively is a journey which involves repentance and conversion. Each leader, each church, begins by asking: "Where am I broken? Where are we broken? Where do I need healing? Where do we need healing?" Where do we need help in order to understand and follow Jesus Christ more fully? Before we engage others, we engage ourselves. We first self-examine.
- Second, having identified some of our own uncertainties and weaknesses, we meet another leader, another church expecting to learn from them before expecting them to learn from us, trusting that the Spirit has given to that other leader, that other church, something for me, something for us, something that will help overcome our own limits, blindness, brokenness, something that will help us be more faithful disciples, more faithful churches.
- Third, as we examine ourselves and learn from others, we reach out to receive gifts from the other church leaders, the other churches. We reach out confessing that we do not know and follow Jesus Christ fully. We reach out with 'broken hands' and sometimes with 'broken hearts' to receive gifts that may heal our own brokenness, gifts that will help us follow Jesus more closely, help our church to be more faithful.

Could consciously practicing 'receptive learning' be of some use in building a little more communion in General Council meetings and in other settings where we are together with other Christians, other churches, other church leaders?

If you are interested in learning more about the practice of receptive learning, send me an email; I will be happy to provide some links and some references. My address: [LARRY MILLER](mailto:LARRY.MILLER).

3. *Coming Together as 'Local Congregation'*

The third practice may be the most important of these three practices for us in MWC. It is in any case an ideal context in which to build communion as we share our journeys with Jesus Christ and learn receptively from each other. This practice is rooted in earliest Christianity and earliest Anabaptist-Mennonite history. It can be called: "Coming Together as a Local Congregation."

In his article on *The 'Anabaptist Tradition': Reclaiming its Gifts, Heeding its Weaknesses*, which is included in the *Reference Notebook*, Hanspeter Jecker identifies the 'establishment of local congregations based on fraternal relationships' as a primary characteristic of the Anabaptist-Mennonite church. He writes:

In this kind of 'community' of voluntary believers no one has everything; but everyone has something. This recognition requires that the gifts of the individual contribute to the wellbeing of the whole, for example, in biblical interpretation or in reaching decisions. (...) Mutual encouragement and admonition are the foundations for decision-making and conflict resolution, and for becoming a forgiving – as well as a forgiven – community.

While a congregational-style of church meeting is most common in the geographically-local church, it can take place in any place where believers gather, from the local church to the national church to the global gathering, including in the MWC General Council.

Even though this kind congregation is called 'local', there is no place where it is excluded. The question is not *where* the believers are gathering but *what is happening* when they gather there. Wherever *it* happens becomes a 'local congregation' when believers gather and discern in this way. 'For where two or three are gathered together in my name', Jesus said, '*there* am I in the midst of them' (Matthew 18:19-20).

Could the members of the General Council come together not only as representatives of and accountable to the autonomous national churches which sent them but *first of all* as members of one (globalized) 'local congregation' accountable to each other, asking finally not what did our autonomous churches hear the Spirit say in their 'local' places before we came, but what do we together hear the Spirit say to us this day, in this 'local' place?

Discernment undertaken and conclusions reached in this way—by the consensus of the General Council gathered as a 'local congregation'— could then be offered to the autonomous national churches, gathered as 'local congregations' in their own places, for their own discernment and conclusions.

As a consensus in accordance with the will of God grows through this process—not only from the local and national to the global and but also from the global to the national and local — communion becomes more universal, not only in geographical breadth but also in the fullness of the faith.

Could the practice of meeting as 'local congregation' work in MWC? Indeed, it could! In fact, it has already worked a number of times! One of the most important examples is the 'Shared Convictions' statement. It was through the practice of gathering as 'local congregation' — even though MWC did not speak of it in this way — that we got our 'Shared Convictions!'

The process leading to the creation of the 'Shared Convictions' was a thirteen-year process of conversation, back and forth between MWC and its autonomous member churches worldwide, from 1993 to 2006, beginning with the decision to convene a Faith and Life Council. Before the first meeting of the Council in 1997, more than 100 member and related churches were asked to submit their statements of faith and respond to a questionnaire; more than 50 from 5 continents did so. A group of 10 readers reviewed all the documents and reported at the Council meeting. In 1998, the book *From Anabaptist Seed*, commissioned by MWC was published and fed into the *Shared Convictions* process. In 2003, the GC approved an initial draft of *Shared Convictions* for study by member churches; their comments reshaped the *Shared Convictions*. In 2006, the GC approved the final draft by consensus. And in the end it all came down to one final word as the General Council gathered in Pasadena, California, USA, and acted like a 'local congregation'.

Article 2 now reads: '*Jesus is the Son of God. Through his life and teachings, his cross and resurrection, he showed us how to be faithful disciples, redeemed the world, and offers eternal life.*'

But until the very last decision on the very last day, there was one more word in the statement: "Jesus is the *incarnate* Son of God." At the end of the 13-year process, there was not yet a consensus to include or exclude that one word. There were blue cards from some parts of the world and orange cards from other parts of the world. Then it happened. Joram Basumata, now of beloved memory but then the sometimes rather quiet leader of the Missionary Church India arose, went to the microphone, and quietly said: "In India, all the gods are incarnate. If we include that word, my church cannot use the *Shared Convictions*." And with Joram's word about

the word all the blue cards turned orange and the 13-year process came to a celebrative end, in the full consensus of all present that day in that place, that globalized 'local' place.

With that decision, the General Council had acted like a local congregation. It did not say that we will now send this wording back to our autonomous churches for their further deliberation, reconvening again in three years to make our final decision, in line with their final decisions. The General Council did say: This is what has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to those of us gathered here this day, in this 'local' place. These convictions, said in this way, on this day, in this place are the convictions that we share.

In the following weeks, MWC sent the *Shared Convictions* around the world for the autonomous member churches – and any other interested church – to receive or reject as each one discerned best in its own 'local' place. The extent of the reception and the use ever since of the *Shared Convictions both in and beyond* MWC has far exceeded our expectations at the time – and built global communion along the way! It should not have been a surprise. After all, a 'local congregation' composed of believers from the whole world may be the very best place to hear what the Spirit is saying to all the churches, to the church universal!

Conclusion

We end where we began: with a few verses from the letter to the Philippians (2:6-8). These Philippian verses may have been one of the earliest Christian hymns: a hymn about the characteristics of the greatest body of Christ builder of all-time, the model for all leaders capable of building communion.

It is with this hymn that we conclude:

Let the same mind be in you that was in Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, did not regard equality with God as something to be exploited, but emptied himself, taking the form of a slave, being born in human likeness. And being found in human form, he humbled himself and became obedient to the point of death – even death on a cross.

As we seek to answer the call to become a global communion of Anabaptist-related churches, may the same mind always be in us that was in Christ Jesus.

Larry Miller
Presented to MWC General Council
Indonesia 2022 – July 2022
Zoom – December 2022

¹ Conrad Kanagy, 'Unity, Oneness, and Communion; National MWC Leaders Respond', page 1.

² *Ibid.*, 3.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 4

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*, 6

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*, 7